

REMARKS

This is in full and timely response to the final Office Action on the merits dated January 21, 2005. Reconsideration and reexamination are respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 14 and 16-19 have been allowed, claims 2-7 and 9-13 stand objected to, and claims 1, 8, and 15 stand rejected. By the foregoing amendment, claims 2, 8, and 15 have been canceled and claims 1, 3, 9, and 12 have been amended. Therefore, claims 1, 3-7, 9-14, and 16-19 remain in this application with claims 1, 9, and 14 being independent.

IN THE DRAWINGS:

The drawings are objected to as being informal. Formal drawings are attached to this amendment.

IN THE SPECIFICATION:

“18” has been changed to “20” on page 5, line 14, and “proximal end 18” has been changed to “distal end 18” on page 7, lines 21, 23, 25, and 26 and page 8, lines 1 and 16, per the examiner’s suggestions. Page 16 (Abstract), line 3, “having proximal and distal ends coupled with the axle” has been changed in accordance with the examiner’s suggestions to “having a proximal end coupled with the axle and also having a distal end.”

IN THE CLAIMS:

Informalities

Claim 9, line 11, “elastic member” has been changed to “elastic backing member”,
5 and claim 12 has been amended to depend from claim 11 for proper antecedent basis. Therefore,
claim 9 should now be in condition for allowance along with claims 10-13 which depend
therefrom, and such is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejections:

10 Claims 8 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being
indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which
applicant regards as the invention.

Without admitting the propriety of these rejections, claims 8 and 15 have been
canceled.

15 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections:

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fasiska
in view of Eglinton. However, the examiner has indicated that claims 2-7 stand objected to as
depending from a rejected base claim (i.e. claim 1) but that they would be allowable if rewritten
20 in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim. Accordingly, claim 1 has
been amended to include all of the limitations of claim 2, claim 2 has been canceled, and claim 3

has been amended to properly depend from claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 should now be in condition for allowance along with claims 3-7 which depend therefrom, and such is respectfully requested.

5 Conclusion:

This application should now be in condition for allowance and such is respectfully requested. If the examiner has any suggestions that would place this application in even better condition for allowance, he is invited to contact the applicant's representative at the telephone number listed below.

Date: February 7, 2005

HARSHAW RESEARCH, INC.
Lawyer's Building
2nd & Main
P.O. Box 418
Telephone (785) 242-9500
Facsimile (785) 242-3308

Respectfully Submitted,



Dale J. Ream
Patent Reg. No. 45,798

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Replacement drawing sheets 1/7, 2/7, 3/7, 4/7, 5/7, 6/7, and 7/7 that include Figs. 1a-7b are attached.